



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

who do not render society adequate service for what they take, and for would-be statesmen who through self-seeking are unable to rise above petty politics. Men want to hear and need to hear again the ringing words of Christ: "Whosoever will not take up his cross and come after me cannot be my disciple"; and they want these words interpreted, not as an invitation to join

the church, but as a command to live in Christ's spirit and attitude toward God and men, and to practice righteousness and brotherhood in all life's relations.

What is Christian? The spirit of this age will know no rest until life is aligned to that standard. The church must be the prophet of the hour and declare: "Thus saith the Lord."

THE SAVED AND THE REGENERATE: A HERESY

REV. RICHARD ROBERTS

Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, New York

The following article raises a question about which few people think. It may be that the distinction between terms is one of academic definition, or it may be also that it involves a real difference as to moral values of religious experience. At any rate, the article will repay careful consideration.

I

Are all the saved regenerate? Are only the regenerate saved? Some apology may perhaps be needed for recalling these ancient items of the Christian vocabulary; yet despite the fact that the words themselves are not nowadays frequently encountered in our religious terminology, the ideas they represent still govern us. And what is still more to the point, the conventional association of salvation and regeneration as different aspects of the same process colors all the religious thinking of the most unsparing modernists among us.

Mr. Bernard Shaw in his preface to *Androcles and the Lion* has entered a necessary protest against the undue

place which is given to what he calls "salvationism" in conventional Christianity. He is perhaps not familiar enough with Christianity as it is preached today to know that, at least in circles that are liberal or even liberalized, this emphasis has largely disappeared. It is only rarely in these days that the Gospel is preached in terms of escape and security. Mr. Shaw might have made a more general and a more valid point if he had first canvassed the extreme elasticity of the words "save" and "salvation" in their New Testament use. The persistency with which a "salvationist" content has been read into the Philippian jailer's question: "What shall I do to be saved?" when

all that the unfortunate man meant was "What on earth shall I do?" is symptomatic of the inveterate tendency in the past to force the great scriptural terms into the Procrustean bed of a schematized dogmatic—an unspiritual and unscientific procedure which is now happily passing away.

It would take us too far afield to trace back to its pagan roots the popular "salvationist" interpretation of the gospel. Readers of this journal are sufficiently familiar with the subject to require no more than the reminder that the various uses of the word—"salvation" in the New Testament are but different aspects of the conception of well-being and that it is sometimes used (as in Phil. 1: 19)¹ without a theological or even a religious content. In the distinctive New Testament idea of salvation two main elements appear to be present. First, that which is associated with the idea of *justification*, which (to put it broadly) means being put right with God, a forensic rendering of the idea of reconciliation. The point which the exegetes make, that the term "to justify," on the analogy of verbs ending in *-ow* means to "declare" righteous rather than to "make" righteous, is somewhat beside the mark. The word "righteousness," which belongs to this cycle, is not used with a single meaning in the New Testament. In the Gospels and sometimes in Paul himself, the word is used to denote a character; but its chief use is to denote a *condition*, that of being right with God. Consequently the distinction between "declaring" and "making" righteous lacks a corresponding difference. For if God declares me to be

right with him, then I *am* right with him; and nothing can alter that.

The second point may be illustrated best by recalling the story of Zacchaeus. "This day is Salvation come into this house, *forasmuch as he also is a Son of Abraham.*" Salvation to Zacchaeus meant being made a member of a family; and it was so he felt it, for he began at once to behave as a member of a family should. "Half of my goods I give to the poor. . . ." That is to say, salvation set him in a right relation to his fellow-men.

So that salvation is properly to be interpreted in terms of a twofold relation of rightness—rightness with God and rightness with man. It is essentially a social experience; and in a hundred ways the New Testament stresses this point. The alien is naturalized into the family of God; the foreigner receives the franchise of the commonwealth of Israel. The Gentile comes within the covenants of promise. So far, of course, the conception does not touch what is important in the popular view of salvation, namely, the eschatological implication. But this is not necessarily absent. For this family, this commonwealth, is that communion of the saints which is one both in heaven and in earth. The peculiar note of the "saved" man is that, wherever he is, he is a member of that communion.

When, however, we come to examine the idea of regeneration, we find that it is regarded as discharging itself in quite another quality of experience. The *locus classicus* is John, chapter 3. It is to be noted first that there this particular experience is spoken of, not as a new birth, but as a birth from above (*ἀνωθεν*)

¹The obvious meaning of this passage is that Paul expects that the circumstances which he views will work out in a satisfactory issue from his troubles.

Further, there is nothing in the passage which indicates that regeneration is something that happens once for all, as it is conventionally taught to be. Still further, it is to be observed that regeneration is plainly stated to issue first of all in a spiritual *vision*. And perhaps it is not foreign to the point to make a fourth observation to the effect that it was spoken, not to an ordinary man in the street, but to a leader of men. And lastly, there is no reference in the passage either to condition in relation to God or to character. Regeneration is specifically the source of vision.

It is hardly correct to associate the "new man" passages in Colossians and Ephesians with John, chapter 3; for the former refer directly to character and habit. Moreover, the "putting on of the new man" is our own act, whereas the birth from above is specifically the act of the Spirit.

That is one limb of the heresy. Salvation and regeneration are different and separate experiences.

II

We have all been unanimous in condemning Nietzsche's classification of mankind into a master-class and a slave-class. On the one hand, we were told, there is the class of those who by reason of temperament, initiative, and strength are predestined to rule. On the other is the type of man who, to quote one of Nietzsche's most distinguished disciples, "thrives best when he is looked after and closely observed, the man who is happy to serve, not because he must, but because he is what he is, the man who is uncorrupted by political and religious lies concerning liberty, equality, and

fraternity, who is half-conscious of the abyss which separates him from his superiors, and who is happiest when he is performing those acts which are not beyond his limitations." This unashamed advocacy of the principle of aristocracy naturally outrages democratically minded people. It looks to us simply a kind of dull recidivism in an age which has ordered its business on the principle that all men are born free and equal. We are not minded at this time of day to go back upon the democratic principle. At the same time, it is necessary that we should clear our minds upon just what is implied in the democratic principle; and it is suggested that democracy fully realized will be a state of society in which are established those conditions of equal opportunity that will enable each of its members without respect of persons to become the full distinctive human thing it is in him to be.

Democracy rests upon the doctrine of equality of worth, and its logic requires equality of opportunity. But it does not necessarily mean that there either is or ever will be equality of capacity. In passing it may be observed that the doctrine of equal human worth implies that the measure of capacity is not a title to corresponding privilege but a measure of obligation. The particular point that is to be stressed here, however, is that Nietzsche's classification of men rests upon the fact of unequal capacity, and is consistent so far with common observation. Where Nietzsche fell into error was in building upon this circumstance a doctrine of a permanent class-ascendancy with subordination for the rest. And it is plain that the indisputable fact which Nietzsche interpreted so perversely must

be translated into terms more congruous with our democratic faith.

But it is not the mere fact of the unequal distribution of capacity that Nietzsche emphasizes. It is rather that this inequality is so distributed that it divides the human mass into two parts. This is akin to Benjamin Disraeli's famous observation that there were two nations in England, the governing and the governed. And it is difficult to escape the judgment that there is a broad and general difference of scale in the molds in which men are cast. For we may everywhere observe how men sort themselves out spontaneously into those who lead and those who follow. Close observation, moreover, will reveal that the difference between these two classes is something more than a difference of education, though education may do something to accentuate the difference. The difference rather seems to reside in a difference of scale in construction, if one may put it in that way. The one man seems to be made on a larger plan than the other. It is beside the point here to analyze the psychological content of this undoubted difference, but it has to do with intellectual power, initiative, resourcefulness, faith—such things as we commonly recognize as the peculiar qualities of the leader of men.

Auguste Comte deduced from his historical studies a fourfold classification of men. These classes were the chiefs, the peoples, the emotionals, and the intellectuals. As a matter of fact, however, this classification is no more than a rendering of our twofold division, extended by a more detailed analysis of the leader class, which consists of the statesman, the idealist, and the thinker.

And it hardly requires discussion to show that it is the combination of these qualities of judgment, of emotional sensibility, and intellectual power that makes the great leader. Similarly when Mr. Arnold Bennett went to see things for himself among the restless workers on the Clyde during the war, he found them sorting themselves out into organizers, workers, energizers, and initiators, which again is simply another cross-section of the same mass and which, like Comte's classification, is only an elaborated version of the simpler classification into leaders and followers.

Every pastor of a church will indorse the truth of this observation. He sees it in his church life all the time. And it is a phenomenon that may be found in various forms in different quarters. In the recently published volume *The Army and Religion*, which is a review and a discussion of a large number of reports by chaplains, officers, Y.M.C.A. workers and others in the British army, upon the attitude of the soldier to religion, it is stated that only about 20 per cent of the soldiers were in any degree vitally and intelligently interested in religion. The book goes on to discuss the implications of this finding, but does not appear to perceive that the phenomenon it deals with is part of a much wider situation, and that the religious problem is no more than a phase of a problem which embraces the whole of life. In the city of Sheffield a number of social workers recently started an inquiry into the social equipment of the worker, a field which embraced his mental outlook, his interests, his reading, and so forth. In a word, the inquiry sought to discover how many Sheffield workers were really

alive. Their finding was this: 25 per cent were returned as well equipped, 60 per cent as inadequately equipped, and 15 per cent as ill equipped. That is to say, just one-quarter of the working population of that city is humanly alive and socially efficient. Observe that the difference between this live quarter and the rest is not due to a difference of education, for they have all alike had the same kind of education. Nor is it that the 25 per cent owes any more to religion than the rest. The difference at bottom appears to be one of constitutional make-up—in a special endowment of “gumption,” *savoir faire*, that quality which is the raw material of leadership.

This is the second limb of the heresy. Equality of human worth is accompanied by inequality of capacity, and the distribution of capacity is of such a kind that it divides mankind into two broad classes, those who lead and those who follow. It is not suggested that this is a permanent division. The time may come when all the Lord's people will be prophets. But meantime this is the actual fact.

III

The traditional theology has always proceeded upon the assumption that humanity can be subsumed under a single category. This is indeed a sound assumption, and there is more than one category under which all men may be gathered. The common theological assumption is the Pauline “All men have sinned,” which is not to be called into question. William James's distinction between once-born and twice-born men is certainly invalid if it is meant to suggest that any man is naturally immune

from estrangement from God. But it has been generally assumed that all the New Testament discussion of human nature and its need and possibility is governed by this one circumstance; so that we have been needlessly busy in trying to fit the great New Testament terms within the four corners of a single need and a single experience. Justification, redemption, adoption, regeneration, reconciliation, and all the rest have been ingeniously interpreted as different phases and parts of a single process. The suggestion is made here that, whatever about the rest, the idea of regeneration has to be abstracted from this group, that its own special meaning should be assigned to it, and that this special meaning does not belong to that particular circle of ideas which is connected with the conception of salvation.

Professor A. C. Hogg in his remarkable book *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* draws a distinction between the people who are “salted” and the people who are “salt.” The former are those who have entered upon a conscious and independent Christian experience. The latter are those who are more or less Christianized. The distinction is essentially sound. There is a class of people in the world who may be said to be living in a disposition and temper toward their brethren which entitles them to be regarded as among the “saved,” even though they may not display any unusual vividness of Christian practice. And these people are the products of what the late Benjamin Kidd would have called “social” or “cultural” heredity. They have been made what they are by the environment into which they were born, by the atmosphere of

home, by the kind of cultural tradition which they have inherited. These are the "salted" people of Professor Hogg's classification. And it is probably true that this class constitutes the great body of modern church membership. It is, moreover, probably true that the great mass of church members will always be recruited from this source. The particular duty of the church to them is education, such an education as will interpret to them their inheritance in the thing that they have received and which will exploit it in the interests of its own growth. This is essentially the office of what we have come to call religious education.

But can these people be regarded as saved in the New Testament sense? We have already pointed out that salvation in the New Testament, when it is stripped of adventitious ideas that have come into it from metaphor and pagan backgrounds, describes a condition of rightness with God and man. If Dr. du Bose is right in defining faith as the disposition of our entire selves holinessward or Godward, then we may infer that salvation is an affair of attitude, disposition, since justification is by faith. The people now in question have the attitude, even though they may not be aware of all that it implies, and it is the task of the church to enable them to realize in experience the full meaning of their condition.

It has always been a theological puzzle how to place these people squarely within the bounds of the "plan of salvation." The case was better with the moral reprobate. It was easy to see what his place in the scheme was; and it is also easy to understand the logicity

of the salvationist school when it insisted that everybody came under this category. Augustine's view that the pagan virtues were *splendida peccata* belongs to the same universe of discourse. But in view of the facts of the case, it is impossible to deny a valid spiritual standing to the large class of people which Professor Hogg calls "salted." The standing is not adequate or complete, but these people are within the pale; and we may as well settle down soon as late to a doctrine of salvation through a sound social heredity, interpreted and confirmed by religious education. And if this outrages any sensitive theological conscience, there are ways of stretching out the doctrine of justification by faith to cover the case.

For the moral reprobate the prescription is repentance and conversion. Of the reality and the efficacy of this remedy in the cases to which it applies there can be no question. But it is necessary to emphasize the fact that there are plenty of people who have an indisputable Christian experience who have yet never passed through this process; and it is useless to pretend that there is any interpretation of their experience which brings it within this rubric. At the same time, whether saved through inheritance and education or by conversion, we are mistaken when we identify the result with the birth from above. It is indeed true that this experience of salvation is a prerequisite of the new birth, and it is not inconceivable that the two things, conversion and regeneration, may happen to a man at the same time. But the point about regeneration is that it brings vision, and there is a multitude of people who are

saved who are nevertheless devoid of vision. They are good faithful pedestrian folk who have enough spiritual and moral sensibility to discern and to follow convincing leadership. And the sum of the matter in brief is this, that these two conceptions of salvation and the new birth correspond to that broad human division of those who follow and those who lead. Salvation is the spiritual standing of the man who follows; but it is the new birth that makes the leader.

Is not this what Jesus meant when he said that "many are called but few are chosen"? The many are called into salvation, but the few are chosen to leadership.

The moral is plain. It is the office of the church to go on proclaiming that call, bidding the reprobate to repent. It is no less the task of the church to educate its children into the full meaning of their salvation, however they have come by it, in respect of both its content and its ethical expression. And it will always be the ministry of the spirit of God to choose out of the saved many, those who have the capacity for leadership, and cause them to enter through the gates of the birth from above into that vision which qualifies them for the high calling of leadership in the Kingdom of God.

This is the whole of the heresy. But is it after all a heresy?